DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 789 HE 012 176

AUTHOR Dougherty, Edward A.
TITLE What is the Most Effective Way to Handle Program Discontinuance? Case Studies From 10 Campuses.
SPONS AGENCY EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 18 Apr 79
NOTE 42p.: Paper presented at the American Association of Higher Education National Conference (Washington, DC, April 18, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies: *College Administration: *College Programs: Departments: *Educational Assessment: Educational Finance: *Financial Problems: Government Role: Higher Education: Leadership Responsibility: Needs Assessment: Power Structure: Private Colleges: *Program Evaluation: *Retrenchment: State Agencies: State Colleges
IDENTIFIERS Florida State University: Louisiana State University: *Program Discontinuance: State University of New York Albany: University of California Berkeley: University of California Riverside: University of Michigan: University of Pennsylvania: University of Washington: University of Wisconsin Eau Claire: University of Wisconsin Madison

ABSTRACT

Effective ways to handle program discontinuance were studied based on experiences at 10 campuses. Two variables that were considered to be institutional approaches to financial difficulties are the degree of financial difficulty and the degree of control exercised by the institutional leaders. The study sample was drawn primarily from large public research universities in the United States, although two smaller regional campuses and one large private research university were also included. Key administrators and faculty were interviewed, and data were collected from a variety of written documents such as financial statements, program review documents, and annual reports. Representatives of state agencies were also interviewed in states where there are active coordinating or governing agencies. Five areas were examined: financial crisis, control and leadership, the role of the state agencies, the review process, and the process of program discontinuance. Recommendations to avoid discontinuance and actions required if closure is desirable or unavailable are offered. The 10 institutions are as follows: Florida State University, Louisiana State University, State University of New York (Albany), University of California (Berkeley), University of California (Riverside), University of Michigan, University of Pennsylvania, University of Washington, University of Wisconsin (Eau Claire), and University of Wisconsin (Madison). (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181789

What is the Most Effective Way to Handle Program Discontinuance? Case Studies from 10 Campuses

Edward A. Dougherty
Assistant to the Vice President
for Academic Affairs
The University of Michigan

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edward A. Dougherty

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

American Association of Higher Education
National Conference, April 18, 1979

HE 012 176

Research Supported in Part by the Exxon Foundation

Summary of Findings

Program discontinuance is a necessary adaptive mechanism for colleges and universities if they are to maintain flexibility and respond to new demands. At the same time there is considerable resistence to cutting programs. Some of that resistence can be overcome with foresight and planning, and we can learn a good deal from the experience of others who have already gone through the process. This study was initially undertaken to test the hypothesis that two variables would determine how an institution might respond to financial difficulties: one was the degree of financial difficulty and the other was the degree of control exercised by the institutional leaders. It was hypothesized that the more difficult the financial situation and the stronger the leadership, the more likely would an institution resort to program discontinuance. What we found, in fact, was a good deal more complex and a good deal more interesting. Before presenting those findings, a summary of procedures is in order.

The sample for this study was drawn primarily from large public research universities in the United States, although two smaller regional campuses and one large private research university were also included. The characteristics and procedures of the universities studied are sufficiently similar to each other to warrant viewing them together.

At least they are sufficiently different from the small private colleges to exclude that group from the study. The problems and procedures for program closure at the small liberal arts college may be worthy of study in themselves, but they are separate issues. The research universities are tied together by a whole set of commitments to research and graduate training that limit their flexibility in dealing with financial problems. At the same time, support for these research and graduate training programs is being called into question, and these programs are more vulnerable to "financial atrophy." The 10 institutions studied include:

Florida State University
Louisiana State University
State University of New York - Albany
University of California - Berkeley
University of California - Riverside
University of Michigan
University of Pennsylvania
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire
University of Wisconsin - Madison

The selection of these universities was made on the basis of the fact that the institution (1) had reviewed and closed programs and/or (2) had gone through recent financial difficulties.

The author visited each of the campuses and interviewed key administrators and knowledgeable faculty. Typically, he saw academic vice presidents, graduate deans, deans, financial officers, institutional research staff and faculty representatives from advisory committees or faculty senates. Data was collected from a variety of written documents such as financial statements, program review documents, and annual reports. In addition, representatives of state agencies were interviewed in every state where there are active coordinating or governing agencies.

Not all cases of program discontinuance cited in the press will be found in this study. The most notable omission is City University of New York. This case was excluded because it involved a multi-campus system intimately entwined with city politics. One can also argue that CUNY is more of study of "financial exigency" than "program closure" per se. Also the case has been widely covered in the higher education journals.[1] Let us now turn to five areas: financial crisis, control and leadership, the role of the state agencies, the review process, and the process of program discontinuance.

---

(1) Edmund L. Volpe, "Retrenchment: The Case at CUNY," in Leadership for Higher Education: The Campus View, ed. by Roger Heyns (Washington, D.C.: America Council on Education, 1977), pp. 155-165. American Association of University Professors, "City University of New York: Mass Dismissals under Financial Exigency," AAUP Bulletin, LXIII, No. 2 (April, 1977), pp. 60-81.

Financial Crisis: One of the most important things to keep in mind about program discontinuance is that it does not save money, in most cases. At best, it reduces future expenditures, but it does not save money unless faculty are actually released. In most of the cases included in this study, the institutions did not want to break tenure contracts and they have simply reassigned faculty to other duties on campus. Some funds may be saved by release of non-tenured faculty, but even then proper notice is required and it may be a year or more before savings can be realized. One notable exception to this point is the State University of New York at Albany. They did cut programs and reduced faculty numbers but even these funds were not released immediately. Many institutions and state agencies that undertake program discontinuance do so not with the intent of making immediate savings, but to improve efficiency in the long run.

If an institution wants to save money by cutting programs and reducing faculty, it should be careful not to cut programs that will reduce student fee revenue in such a way as to cost the institution more than it is saving by reducing faculty. The University of Pennsylvania did a careful cost analysis before closing its program in Allied Health and found that it would be economical only if the student positions lost in the School could be picked up by other units on campus. Because the positions could be picked up by other schools and colleges at Penn, without necessarily requiring the addition of new faculty positions, dollar

savings could be realized in the long run. This type of cost-benefit analysis can be extremely important in making a decision about closing a program.

A second thing to keep in mind about program closure is that it cannot be done in the midst of severe financial crisis, in most cases. If a budget cut comes, it often comes in the middle of the year when funds are already committed. Such a crisis demands an immediate response in the short run, and most institutions do not have review and discontinuance procedures in place so as to allow for an immediate response. Again, Albany is the exception. They did have procedures in place and were able to put them in effect so that programs could be identified for discontinuance within about a five-week period.

When a financial crisis strikes a severe blow to an institution, it will tend to cut across-the-board rather than cut programs. Across-the-board cuts were made at Minnesota, Riverside, Washington, and Wisconsin and usually required taking faculty positions by attrition. Across-the-board cuts can be effective if they are not too severe nor too prolonged. They can weaken the whole fabric of quality in an institution if they are prolonged, however, and in some cases, institutions will choose to cut out entire programs rather than cut across the board.

Third, while most institutions will make across-the-board cuts rather than program cuts in the face of severe financial

crisis, some sense of financial urgency is usually necessary if the institution is to bring its faculty and students to accept program closure. One of the striking things about the institutions studied is how few closed programs simply on the basis of quality. Only Berkeley's closure of the School of Criminology was done without reference at all to financial considerations. All other institutions were prompted to begin a process of program review, which might lead to closure, because of either a financial crisis or a "technical crisis" such as declining job markets for graduates of a particular program. In most institutions studied, the programs that were closed were called to the attention of the dean, vice president or coordinating agency because of some kind of crisis. The crisis may be one of leadership or quality, but more often than not, it is because of the loss of some source of external funds or the need for additional resources to maintain quality. For example, Michigan's Population Planning Program was cut when key sources of funds from outside the University were cut off and the department chairman asked the School of Public Health to pick up losses. The School of Public Health was going through its own financial difficulties and decided it would be better to cut the program out entirely rather than let it limp along. In many cases, financial or technical crises may not be controllable by the program or institution, but they should be careful to avoid crises of their own making if they wish to avoid program closure.

Another way to avoid closure is to build in sufficient flexibility in faculty appointments to weather unexpected storms. Those institutions that survived the depression of the mid-seventies by only cutting positions and not faculty had such flexibility. They tend to be either large enough to have sufficient turnover to make budget cuts simply by putting a freeze on hiring, or they had sufficient flexibility in non-tenured ranks to help them survive. The University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire has begun to systematically hire people outside tenure track positions in order to maintain flexibility in anticipation of future enrollment declines. The key question for institutions like Eau Claire is will they be able to gain sufficient flexibility in the face of 30-40 percent enrollment declines, or will they have to release tenured faculty as well. In some cases the answer to this question will determine whether or not they can survive. The University of California at Riverside has begun to identify a core number of faculty for each of its graduate programs. If the number falls below that minimum, then the administration will begin to look at whether to continue the program.

Program discontinuance will not save money in the short run, but it is, paradoxically, most often undertaken in the face of some financial difficulty. Careful financial analysis will be needed to understand what savings can be realized and to demonstrate to various constituencies the necessity of making such cuts. If one wants to avoid discontinuance, then a flexible staffing pattern may help the program or institution weather future storms.

Control and Leadership: The most important thing about control and leadership as it relates to program discontinuance is that there were virtually no cases in which programs were closed as a result of faculty actions. Faculty don't close programs, for a variety of reasons. They are concerned about the moral and legal obligations to their colleagues; they fear setting off a downward spiral of decline; and they are reluctant to make a final judgment on a colleague's quality. One dean described his faculty as suffering from "survivors guilt" - that is - they would ask "why not me" whenever a colleague was threatened by program closure.

The reluctance of faculty to make cuts in their own program requires strong leadership to pursue what may be very unpopular decisions. The job of the administrator in program discontinuance is primarily one of convincing others of the rightness of his or her judgment. It is largely a job of convincing all constituencies that the institution will be better off without program "X." What are the tools with which the administrator has to work?

First is the review document. This will be discussed in detail in an upcoming section, but it should be noted here that the review document will be the single most important item available to the person whose job it is to implement a discontinuance. The purpose of the review document is to expand the pool of expertise to include more than just the dean or vice president or president recommending discontinuance. It must include judgments from trusted peers who are well respected and whose conclusions

follow in logical sequence. The discontinuance of the Berkeley Criminology program is an example of a well documented review. The Sindler Committee did an extremely thorough job in the six month period of deliberations. It met with all interested parties and drew its conclusions in such a way as to leave no room for doubt about the quality of the program. They identified the core problem of the School as not being able to meet its own stated goals of providing both academic and professional training. After carefully documenting this failure, they then asked if Criminology should continue in some form as an academic discipline on the Berkeley campus. They examined the undergraduate and graduate programs and concluded that it should be continued, but on a much smaller scale and with a very different direction. They concluded by suggesting that such a program might be located in the Law School, and their recommendations were eventually implemented. The report was thorough and clear enough to allow the graduate dean and chancellor to recommend with confidence the discontinuance of the School.

With the help of a well documented review, the academic administrator can turn his energy to the task of eliciting support for a proposed discontinuance. Support must come from two groups- the faculty on the one hand, and the board that has final authority for eliminating a program on the other. On the one hand, faculty must have full opportunity to express their views on a proposed closure through open meetings, forums, debates and discussions.

Students too must have the same opportunity to present their views. At Michigan we met with faculty in the program and faculty outside the program at their meetings, and we held open hearings for them to present their views to us. On the other hand, administrators must educate the board of trustees or other groups on the boarder between the University and the outside community. Thomas Langfitt at the University of Pennsylvania did an especially good job of working with the health affairs subcommittee of Penn's Board before making a final recommendation to the full board.

The credibility of the administration closing a program will also be an important factor of leadership. This factor in program discontinuance is very difficult to measure or discuss rationally, but if faculty or board members do not trust the administration, then its job is much more difficult. It will be accused of heavy-handedness, favoritism or politics. Innumberable secondary issues will be thrown into the discussion and opposition will be thrown up at every turn. If, on the other hand, the faculty believes in the fairness and good judgment of the administration, then there will be an openness to hear the discussion of issues without a knee-jurk negative response. The central administration of the University of North Carolina (not originally included in this study, but recently visited by the author) is a good example of the importance of credibility. The administration has been able to implement a process of program review and discontinuance, in part, because of the trust faculty and campus administrators have in William Friday.

The lack of leadership will clearly have a negative affect on program discontinuance. At several of the campuses studied the turnover of key administrative positions contributed to the lack of action in programmatic areas. In one institution the President, academic vice president and graduate dean all left within 18 months of each other. These changes, combined with the lack of clear budgetary authority in any one of the vice presidential areas, meant that no programs have been closed in spite of financial strain. It may be no program closure is called for in this situation, but the pattern of rapid administrative turnover and no discontinuance is repeated on other campuses.

Another pattern of leadership that is repeated on several campuses is the role of the graduate dean in the process of discontinuance. For example, at Berkeley, Florida State, Louisiana State and Riverside, the graduate dean controls the flow of admission into graduate programs, giving him or her a valuable control mechanism over graduate programs. Second, the graduate dean is often vested with authority to review programs and can spot potential areas of weakness. Third, the graduate dean often has the credibility to review and discontinue programs because she or he is seen as protecting centers of excellence in the institution. All of these factors can be important in the process of review and discontinuance.

The Role of State Agencies: Robert Berdahl suggests three important roles for the statewide agency in the area of program review and discontinuance: 1) to do reviews for institutions that are not currently doing them; 2) to assure that quality reviews are done; and 3) to assure that evaluations are placed in the broader context of statewide, regional and national needs. Berdahl estimates that in 1975 eleven of the twenty-eight coordinating boards were engaged in some form of program review with two others in the process of developing procedures.(2) It is likely that today there are even more boards doing more reviews, especially if the nineteen consolidated governing boards are included in the count. One finds generally an overall trend toward more formal systems of coordination and program review at the state level, and the research universities studied in this paper are no exception. California, Florida,

(2) Robert Berdahl, "Critical and Strategies for Program Discontinuance and Institutional Closure," (paper presented for the Kellogg In-Service Training Seminar, BHEEO Annual Conference, New Orleans, La., July 30, 1975).

Louisiana, New York, Washington and Wisconsin have all undertaken some form of statewide program review since 1970. The Universities of Michigan and Minnesota operate under a constitutional provision giving those universities constitutional autonomy, but Michigan does coordinate new programs in the state through the Michigan Council of College and University Academic Officers, and Minnesota cooperates with reviews conducted by the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

The primary purpose for these statewide reviews is to provide the state, regional or national perspectives to program planning. For example, the lateral reviews done in states such as California, Florida, Louisiana, New York, Washington and Wisconsin normally examine all programs in one discipline or professional area to determine the needs of the state for graduates in that area. Review teams may then look at the quality of existing programs and make recommendations about the future needs of the system. The diversity of the review process is described in the next section.

At the same time state agencies are doing reviews, institutions are doing very much the same kind of reviews on a local level. Institutions in this study all do reviews on their own, the only exception being Louisiana State that stopped its review process when the state agency began theirs because of the extreme time demand placed on the institution

by the external review process. There may be some smaller institutions that do not do reviews or that do not do high quality reviews, but they would be the exception. The review process done at the state level may duplicate what goes on at the campus level. One should not belittle, however, the state, regional or national perspective added by the state agency review. For example, in Florida a review of nursing pointed out national trends in nursing education that were not being followed within the state. Large amounts of money and effort were being spent on the preparation of nurses to deliver secondary care, but the trends indicate a need for more nurses prepared to deliver care at primary and tertiary levels. With that information the state agency and the institutions are beginning to plan for the appropriate number of nurses to be trained for needed levels of practice.(3)

In addition to providing a broader perspective to the review process, it is sometimes pointed out that state agencies are interested more in a "summative" review process, as opposed to a "formative" process (the summative review is aimed at making a decision whether to continue or discontinue a program, a formative review is interested in making suggestions

---

(3) State University System of Florida Nursing Program Review: Consultants Report (Tallahassee, Fla.: Board of Regents, 1977), p. 31.

about how a program can be improved). Looking closely at the relationship between internal and external reviews and the kind of decisions that result from them, one does not find this distinction to hold up, at least in terms of relating reviews to program closure. Figure 1 shows that four institutions (Berkeley, Michigan, Penn and Riverside) are primarily involved with internal reviews and have closed programs without any help from the state agency.

Figure 1

Internal and External Reviews Related To Program Closure

	Reviews Internal Only	Reviews Internal and External	
Resulting in Program Closure	Berkeley Michigan Penn Riverside	Albany Eau Claire Florida Washington	Albany Florida Louisiana Washington
Not Resulting in Program Closure	Minnesota	Louisiana Madison	

In states where both internal and external reviews have taken place, programs have been closed after internal reviews as often as after external reviews. Only in Louisiana did the state agency, after external review, close a program that would not have been closed by the institution itself. Pressure may have been created to move the institutions to review and close programs because of the existence of state agency review procedures, but one cannot argue that institutions do not close programs on their own. Institutions without state agency review do close programs and institutions with such reviews close programs. The presence or absence of a state agency and statewide review procedure is not a decisive factor in determining the presence or absence of program closure.

Furthermore, in states and institutions where no formal program closure has occurred, there are continuing "program adjustments" that change programs. These changes may be a form of program closure, over the long run. They are certainly adaptive mechanisms which are frequently used by institutions. For example, the University of Minnesota and the University of Wisconsin at Madison continually review the quality of programs. Neither institution has closed programs, but adjustments have been made to reflect changing demand and quality.

The primary function of state level review is to provide a broader perspective to the review process, but questions can be raised about the efficiency of duplicating reviews in order to

provide that perspective. If there were a greater level of trust between the state agencies and the institutions, then more efficient ways might be found for getting that job done. In some cases the level of trust is good, such as in Wisconsin where the major research universities are allowed to do their own reviews. In other states there is little trust. For example, in one state the state agency representatives do not feel that any objective evaluation can be done by faculty. Even outside reviewers are suspect because they can easily represent the position of colleagues on the campus under review. This particular state agency relies solely on quantitative data, saying that a high quality program will have positive quantitative indicators. One result of this approach is a good deal of conflict between the state agency and the campuses when the state agency recommends program closure. When the institution and state agency take up battle stations, then little of the broader perspective of state, region or nation comes through to the institution. Only as the state agency wins individual battles can they impose their will on the institution. The institution, in turn, does everything it can to subvent the intention of the state agency and little progress is made. As an alternative, a more cooperative approach could lead to gains for both the state agency and the institution.

Rather than offering a "political" or a "collegial" model for understanding the relations between state agencies and institutions, Moratorana and Kuhns offer a "theatrical" model.

they note that the present state of activities can be likened to "a theatrical production in its early rehearsal stages: the roles have been more than tentatively assigned, but the actors are still jockeying for position and attempting to upstage one another." (4)

The Review Process: Whether the state agency and the institutions cooperate or not, the single most important factor in program discontinuance is a flexible and fair review process. In the words of Borak and Berdahl:

> When participants viewed the process as flexible and fair, they then tended to perceive the overall review more favorably despite any identified deficiencies in the selection of programs reviewed or the criteria used to review them. The latter two, if deficit, were often viewed as susceptible to later improvement through a fair and flexible process. (5)

One might add that when the process is not viewed as flexible and fair, no amount of tinkering later on will help much.

There are four basic questions that must be addressed concerning program review: Who has the authority to review? What programs will be reviewed? What criteria will be used?

---

(4) S.V. Martorana & Eilene Kuhns, "Academic Programming," AAHE/ERIC Research Currents (September, 1978), p. 11.

(5) Robert J. Borak and Robert O. Berdahl, "State-Level Academic Program Review" (Report #107, prepared for the In-Service Education Program, Education Commission of the States, February, 1978) p. 18.

And, what procedures are most appropriate for the situation?

First, the question of authority: Who has the authority to review programs? The faculty? The campus administration? The graduate school? The state agency? Looking at figure 2 one sees that the answer is "yes" to all options! No one pattern prevails. Looking at internal authority to review programs, one sees that the graduate school often has authority to review graduate programs, but that pattern is not universal. In some cases graduate and undergraduate programs are reviewed together by a special task force or review committee that may be part of the faculty senate. In other cases, the authority for review may rest with the deans and/or vice presidents for academic affairs. In some cases the authority to review programs shifts from one group to another on the same campus, depending on the circumstances. Most campuses do have some informal agreement about the authority to review programs, but as questions of review inevitably lead to questions of continuance and discontinuance of programs those informal agreements may need to be more formalized.

The question of external authority to review programs is more complex. Berdahl points out that all system-wide governing boards, such as the Boards of Regents in California, Florida and Wisconsin, in theory, have authority to review

Figure 2 - Program Review Procedures

	Who Has Authority to Review	Selection of Programs for Review	Criteria*	Process	Outcome
Albany	external - State Education Department	quantitative indicators 3-4 reviews per year	quality and need	lateral reviews, external evaluators	programs cut
	internal- graduate office- '75-select Comm. '76-task force	all departments reviewed on 7 year cycle	quality	internal evaluators	programs cut
Berkeley	external- California System	ad hoc, as issues arise	quality and need	lateral reviews, external/ internal evaluators	no cuts, aid in planning
	internal- graduate school	ad hoc as issues plus 6-8 graduate reviews per year	quality	internal evaluators, external consultants	mostly formative, one school cut
Florida State	external- Florida Board of Regents	quantitative indicators	quality and need	lateral reviews, external evaluators	one program cut - aid in planning
	internal- Graduate Council	all graduate programs reviewed on 6 year cycle	quality	internal evaluation, outside consultants may be used	primarily for program improvement but one school cut

* See individual case studies for details.

	Authority	Selection	Criteria	Process	Outcome
Louisiana State	external-Board of Regents	all Ph.D. programs reviewed	quality	external evaluators	programs cut
	internal-Graduate School	suspended when external process began			
Michigan	internal-Vice-President for Academic Affairs and schools and colleges	all programs reviewed at end of term, appts. of dean or dept. head	quality	varied	primarily formative but one program cut
Minnesota	internal-Graduate School and schools and colleges	all programs reviewed on regular cycle	quality	external evaluators	formative- no programs cut
Pennsylvania	internal-vice-presidents and schools and colleges	ad hoc as issues arise plus 6 year reviews coordinated with deanship appointments	quality and cost	internal evaluators	one school cut
Riverside	external-California System	ad hoc as issues arise	quality and need	lateral reviewers external/internal evaluators	no cuts - aid in planning
	internal-Graduate Council	all graduate programs reviewed in order of establishment	quality and technical factors	internal evaluators	several programs cut faculty lost by attrition
	Committee on Educational Policy	review of undergraduate programs abandoned.			

	Authority	Selection	Criteria	Process	Outcome
Washington	external- Council on Postsecondary Education	quantitative indicators	quantitative indicators	council reviewed date	programs cut
	internal- graduate schools and schools and colleges	ad hoc 4-5 per year	quality and need	internal evaluators	one program consolidated
Wisconsin-Eau Claire	external- Systemwide Administration	quantitative indicators - MA & Specialist degree programs plus ad hoc as issues arise	quality and need	lateral reviews - internal and external evaluators	planning aid - no programs closed at Eau Claire
	internal- Academic Policies Committee	quantitative indicators 4 year cycle for undergrad. programs	quality	internal evaluators	some programs cut
	Graduate Council	graduate programs on regular cycle	quality	internal evaluators	some programs cut
Wisconsin-Madison	external-	ad hoc as issues arise	quality and need	lateral reviews internal/ external evaluators	planning aid - no cuts at Madison
	internal- Academic Affairs plus schools and colleges	quantitative indicators. 10 year cycle in LLS	quality	internal evaluators	formative

programs.[6] These boards, however, may delegate that authority to the individual campuses, as happens in California and Wisconsin, retaining for themselves authority to review any programs in a given area as the need arises. For example, Wisconsin allowed its major graduate campuses at Madison and Milwaukee to review their own masters and doctoral degree programs but reserved the authority for system-wide audit of masters and specialist programs on other campuses. Wisconsin also does lateralreviews in areas such as classics or computer science to determine overall state needs. At the same time, more detailed program reviews are done internally on every campus.

The authority for program review is not always clear in the state coordinating agencies (as opposed to governing boards). Coordinating boards vary widely in their power to review existing programs, ranging from no action to power to recommend program discontinuance. The University of Minnesota, for example, cooperates voluntarily with the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board, even though the University has constitutional autonomy,and the Coordinating Board has no authority over the

---

(6) Berdahl, "Criteria & Strategies," 1975, pp. 5-6.

University. On the other hand, the State Education Department in New York, which functions as a coordinating body for all of education, public and private in the State, has authority to review and "deregister" programs. Again, the trend is toward state agencies to assume more authority for review, and in some cases discontinuance. There is also a trend to formalize the review process within those systems.

The second question is one of what programs will be reviewed? Berdahl again points out the need to select those few programs that can be evaluated in depth within the capacity of the group doing the reviews. To review on a more massive basis will result in either great superficiality or an overloaded board and/or budget.(7) The sample of institutions in this study show both extremes of superficiality and overwork. In the State of Washington virtually all graduate-PhD programs were reviewed at once. An initial aduit of programs was done, identifying programs with low degree productivity. A second audit identified some 300 duplicate programs that were subsequently all reviewed at once. Only quantitative indicators were used in this review, yet it took nearly three years to complete. Many faculty criticized the process as being superficial and unproductive.

As seen in Figure 4 a more typical pattern is to use the quantitative indicators to select programs for review, allowing

---

(7) Ibid., p. 10.

for a few comprehensive reviews. As one dean said, a college executive committee or graduate council simply cannot absorb data from more than six or eight programs a year, especially if they are involved in other on-going business. At both the state agency and the institutional level some "trip-wire" is needed to trigger the review mechanism, or some regular cycle of review is necessary. One should not assume, however, that only negative indicators will trigger the review mechaism. Several institutions have found it advisable to review one or two programs of high quality, with positive indicators, along with one or two of suspected low quality, with negative indicators. These indicators will most often be indices like degree productivity, faculty productivity and student credit hours.

Other state agencies and institutions will review programs in logical clusters. For example, the Florida Board reviews all programs of one discipline across the state. Some institutions select all programs in related areas, such as natural science, social science or humanities, for review in a given period. Institutions like Michigan and Penn review programs in conjunction with the appointment of a dean or department chairman giving the option of changing personnel if the program is weak, or selecting personnel with particular strengths to match the needs of the program. Finally, an institution like Berkeley reviews six to eight programs a year, some good and some weak, selected on the basis of logical groupings. Ad hoc reviews will also

be done as issues arise. It was one of these ad hoc reviews that eventually led to the discontinuance of the School of Criminology.

The third question is one of criteria: What criteria will be used to evaluate programs? Mingle identifies two distinct types of reviews that vary by the criteria used for evaluating programs. One type of review is quantitative, concerned with such things as degree productivity, faculty work loads and student credit hours. The other type of review is qualitative dealing with a broader set of criteria such as the quality of faculty as judged by peers, the quality of students and the nature of the curriculum. In most cases the campuses and the state agencies combine th e criteria in some fashion. The state agencies are more likely to look at quantitative factors such as need, degree productivity and workloads, but these quantitative factors may also be used by the internal review committees either to trigger a review or to be used along with a more qualitative evaluation. We have already cited the example of the Washington Council on Postsecondary Education using only quantitative data. By way of contrast we might cite the Berkeley review of the School of Criminology that looked only at the quality of the program. The review committee at Berkeley looked only at qualitative issues such as how well the program was fulfilling its mission and the quality of its offerings.

In fact, the quantitative indicators for the program were quite positive, but the qualitative factors left much to be desired in the eyes of the review committee.

The Education Commission of the States outlined 10 criteria that are frequently used by various states in evaluating programs. They combine the quantitative and qualitative and reflect the concern of many state agencies. They are:

1. the number of graduates in each of the last five years
2. enrollment
3. size of classes and cost per course
4. cost per program graduate
5. faculty workload
6. program quality as reflected in national rankings, faculty qualifications, positions of graduates
7. total production of graduates
8. economies or improvements in quality if consolidated or eliminated.
9. student interests demand
10. appropriateness of program to institutional mission (8)

The National Board emphasizes that single measures of quality should not be applied to very diverse programs, but, rather, multiple indicators of quality should be developed. They also

---

(8) National Board of Graduate Education, Doctoral Manpower Forecasts and Policy, No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: N.B.G.E., 1973), p. 20.

say that statewide planners should resist the temptation to apply simplistic formulas to doctoral programs, such as the elimination of any programs with fewer than two graduates per year. Such measures might be singles to flag programs in need of further review but should not be used as a sole basis for elimination.

Russo and Brown focus on five criteria that are more typical of those used by internal review committees. They are:

1. the quality of instruction and learning
2. the quality of faculty
3. centrality of programs contribution to the institution and other universities
4. program value and or uniqueness
5. potential

They propose careful data collection and analysis that would allow evaluators to rank programs numerically by these criteria. Programs with different objectives could weigh the criteria used to judge success in meeting program objectives.(9) This numerical approach has the advantage of lending an aura of objectivity to program evaluation but it does not hide the fact that

---

(9) J. Robert Russo and David G. Brown, "A Model for Internal Program Review," College and University, Vol. LII, No. 3 (Spring 1977), pp. 288-298.

in the final analysis the judgments of quality are still judgments of individual evaluators.

Finally, the question of process: What is the most appropriate methodology for program review? Once again, no single pattern of evaluation is universal. The methodology is selected that is most appropriate to the circumstances, under the best conditions. Under the worst, the method is selected on the basis of political convenience. Don Gardner offers five definitions of evaluation based on methodological considerations. They are:

1. evaluation as professional judgment lending expert opinion on programs
2. evaluation as measurement, which uses some formalized instruments of evaluation
3. evaluation as the assessment of congruence between performance and objectives, which compares measured performance against specified goals.
4. decision-oriented evaluation, which examines performance to continuously assess progress
5. goal-free evaluation which examines performance regardless of goals. (10)

The most common method of evaluation used in the universities included in this study is evaluation based on professional judgment. The professionals may be from outside the program or outside

---

(10) Don E. Gardner, "Five Evaluation Frameworks: Implications for Decision Making in Higher Education, Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLVIII, No. 5 (Sept/Oct, 1977), pp 571-593.

the institution. In some cases they may include one or two members of the program under review. At Michigan we have found one effective method of evaluation is to use three evaluators from outside the University, one from the area being studied, one from a related area and one from an unrelated area. The purpose of including an unrelated evaluator is to provide opportunity for someone to raise the ultimate question: Is it worth doing at all?

The pattern of peer evaluators seems to work best for institutionally oriented reviews that are formative in nature, that is, aimed at identifiying areas of program improvement. This pattern can also be used, however, for summative reviews, aimed at a decision to continue or discontinue a program. With the exception of Washington's Council on Postsecondary Education no program has been discontinued without some form of peer review. In some cases the evaluators are internal to the institution and in some cases external, but the important thing seems to be rendering some professional judgment on the quality and/or effectiveness of the program.

The process of program discontinuance: With all that has gone before, the actual process of program discontinuance may seem rather anti-climatic. At some point, a dean, a vice president or board must say no more students will be admitted to program "X" and faculty are either released or given other duties.

Again the question of authority for program discontinuance must be addressed. Usually the governing board has the final authority to make such decisions, but in many cases the real battles have already been fought by the time the decision gets to a board. The board's role, however, may be an important one in terms of fending off external constituents who will inevitably arise to say no university worthy of the name can exist without program "X." Clear lines of authority should not be overlooked in the process of program discontinuance. Because the process will inevitably be political in nature, the Board will want to listen to one or more of those external constituents and may reverse the recommendation to discontinue a given program. For this reason, the education of the Board to the realities of the situation will be as important as the education of the faculty and students involved. Thomas Longfit at Penn recognized this educational task and spent considerable time with a committee of the Board of Trustees going over the review document that led to the discontinuance of the School of Allied Medical Professions.

What kinds of programs get closed? A sample of eleven institutions is not one from which conclusions can be drawn, but there are some interesting trends. In the major research universities the programs that are most likely to be discontinued are those outside commonly accepted definition of the University. They often are professional training programs that do little to contribute to the mission of the university, as ill defined and imprecise as that mission may be. One of the reasons programs

closure is so difficult is because only programs that clearly go beyond the definition of the institution get cut out, under normal circumstances.

Being on the cuts may mean not meeting quality standards or economic/technical standards. It may also mean that the institution simply does not want to include a given program within its scope of activities. For example, Berkeley decided the way the School of Criminology was doing criminology was no longer appropriate to the definition of a professional school as defined by the Berkeley review team. In the same way, Penn decided their School of Allied Medical Professions, although strong among its peers, was no longer appropriate to the definition of Penn as a major research university. The School offered only undergraduate courses and did little research. It was therefore ruled outside the definition of the university when demands were made for increased support for the School.

In some cases the state agency helps define the appropriateness of a given program to the mission of either the institution itself or the state educational system as a whole. For example, New York's State Education Department defined History and English graduate programs as no longer appropriate to the needs of the state. Louisiana's Board of Regents said the graduate program in Political Science at Louisiana State University did not meet the appropriate definition of quality. In both cases the campus

representatives argued strongly for the maintenance of these programs as essential to the definition of their institutions. The programs under discussion were seen as essential to the "core" of the University.

When a program no longer contributes to the mission of the institution or state, then it becomes vulnerable to discontinuance. That mission may be defined in quantitative, qualitative or programmatic terms. It may be defined loosely or arbitrarily by one individual, for example, a president who wishes to give his or her institution a clear focus, or it may be defined by consensus from a large member of constituencies. The mission may never be very precise in the face of program closure. Depending on the circumstances, the institution may come to the decision that program "X" is no longer within the bounds of the mission of that institution.

Often the demand for increased support or some other catalytic event such as the search for new leadership raises the question of whether the program contributes sufficiently to the mission of the broader unit. For example, at Penn., the School of Allied Medical Professions asked for increased support from the central administration in order to qualify for federal funds. At Michigan the withdrawal of outside funds from Population Planning and the request of the department for increased support from the School of Public Health prompted the Dean and Executive Committee to look more closely at the program's

contribution to the School's mission. Eau Claire tends to be more sensitive to market changes for its graduates, and it defines its mission more in terms of market demands for its graduates. Hence, programs phased out there were ones with declining student demand. Similar considerations operated at Florida State when it eliminated its School of Engineering Science, and when market conditions changed, the administration regretted the closure. Albany, on the other hand, was forced to redefine and narrow its mission not because of changes in the market for its graduates, but because of severe cuts in state appropriations. Once again, we are reminded that it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate financial and quality or mission-oriented concerns. Dollars will often define quality and mission, and a dollar crisis may be the catalyst leading to redefinitions of quality and mission. It is important to note, however, that programs do not get cut only because of a dollar crisis. Qualitative and mission-oriented concerns may be addressed outside the sphere of financial difficulties, as seen at Berkeley and Louisiana.

Another factor that is important in determining whether a program will be closed is "opportunity." In several of the cases studied there was an opportunity for moving tenured faculty without violating the tenure obligation. At the University of Washington, for example, the Home Economics Department could close several of its programs because of the opportunity to move tenured faculty. Several faculty had voluntarily left and there were several retirements possible. Others could be shifted

to new assignments. There were also a small number of tenured faculty involved in the Berkeley-Criminology closing. Out of more than 20 faculty in the program, only five were tenured. All of those five were shifted to other schools and colleges on campus. The University of Pennsylvania School of Allied Medical Professions also had tenured faculty, and there was opportunity to develop relations with another Health Science School in Philadelphia. Most tenured faculty will find positions outside Penn. One will move to another position within the Medical School. Often, without the opportunity to deal with tenured faculty no program will be closed, but there are circumstances under which program closure will take place even without that opportunity, such as at Albany where the financial conditions of the state required rather radical definition of the institution's scope and mission.

Finally, programs that are discontinued seem to be isolated - for some physically isolated, in most cases isolated from other programs and departments. It might be more accurate to say that those programs that are not discontinued have a large number of supporters who say at the critical moment, we cannot get along without program "Y." Program "Y" provides some vital services that others feel are essential. Program "X," on the other hand, finds too few to lend support when the time comes to consider its continuance. At Michigan the Population Planning Program was performing a good deal of service to foreign nationals but departments in the School of Public Health or elsewhere in

the University did not say that the services of the program were essential to their operation. By contrast, several units, including the University Hospital at Michigan, said that the Program in Speech and Hearing was essential to their operations and should be continued, if not as a part of the Medical School, then as part of another unit in the University. The program was shifted to the Special Education Program in the School of Education.

What can be done, then, to avoid discontinuance?

1) Set priorities based on a clear understanding of the institution's mission;

2) Develop curricular and faculty relations with other units;

3) Expand functions within program guidelines and don't overspecialize curriculum.

4) Do long range planning

5) Don't let quality deteriorate.

6) Maintain strong leadership.

7) Avoid financial difficulties of your own making

8) Keep an eye on student numbers both enrollment and placement of graduates.

9) Build in a sufficient number of flexible, non-tenured appointments to weather unexpected storms.

And what if closure is desirable or inavailable?

1) establish line of authority for program closure

2) establish agreed upon review procedures

3) establish procedure for making priority decisions

4) establish procedures for giving notice to or relocating faculty and staff

5) provide for input from faculty and students and for handling their needs, legal and otherwise

6) If programs are cut to save money, cut programs where real dollar savings can be made, not ones that produce more revenue than expenditures.